

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 JUSTIN ODELL LANGFORD,

Case No. 3:19-cv-00594-MMD-WGC

6 Petitioner,

ORDER

7 v.

8 WARDEN RENEE BAKER, *et al.*,

9 Respondents.

10 This habeas matter is before the Court on Respondents' second Motion for
11 Enlargement of Time (ECF No. 21). This motion was filed on March 20, 2020—the first
12 extended deadline to respond to Petitioner Justin Odell Langford's Petition for Writ of
13 Habeas Corpus (ECF No. 5).

14 Anticipating another request for an extension, Langford filed Objections to any
15 Further Request for Extensions to File Response (ECF No. 20) on March 19, 2020. He
16 asserts that, because the Nevada Attorney General has three offices and employs
17 numerous paralegals, "there is no excuses [*sic*] that records could not be redacted in time"
18 for Respondents' counsel to file a response. He the preemptively asks the Court to deny
19 any further requests by Respondents for more time.

20 Respondents' second motion requests an additional 30 days to respond to the
21 Petition because counsel has been unable with due diligence to timely complete the
22 answer. Counsel represents that a response is in the review stage but this case involves
23 over 200 exhibits that require redaction of the names of underage victims and witnesses.
24 Additionally, increased caseloads, case reassignments, and staffing shortages have
25 caused delay. Finally, the review process has been hampered by the recent public health
26 crisis because the reviewing attorney has spent significant time managing urgent
27 administrative and personnel issues.

28 Federal habeas actions are civil actions and subject to the reporting requirements

1 of the Civil Justice Reform Act of 1990 ("CJRA"), 28 U.S.C. § 471 *et seq.* The CJRA sets
2 a three-year goal for resolution of each civil case on the merits, *id.* § 476(a)(3), and
3 encourages "setting, at the earliest practicable time, deadlines for filing motions and a time
4 framework for their disposition," *id.* § 473(a). Although the procedural and legal complexity
5 of some habeas actions may require extensions of deadlines, the Court actively attempts
6 to posture each case for a merits decision within three years of filing.

7 Langford commenced this action in September 2019. (ECF No. 1.) To date, both
8 parties have sought extensions of time to complete briefing (see ECF Nos. 8, 11, 13, 14,
9 15, 16); however, this case is still postured for timely resolution. Respondents' motion
10 presents good cause for the extension. See LR IA 6-1; LR 26-4.

11 It is therefore ordered that Respondents' Motion for Enlargement of Time (ECF
12 No. 11) is granted. Respondents have until April 22, 2020, to answer or otherwise respond
13 to the petition for writ of habeas corpus.

14 DATED THIS 20th day of March 2020.

15
16 

17 MIRANDA M. DU
18 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28